This article reviews both traditional and modern approaches for capturing lithics. The authors then present the potential of RTI, a method allowing for more detailed high-resolution details of flake scars, use wear etc, and compare its performance against photogrammetry. The paper is thorough and well written, although the introduction is a little light on references, particularly for lithic illustrations and photography (e.g. see Cerasoni et al. 2021; https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251466, Timbrell 2022; https://doi.org/10.1080/01977261.2022.2092299). The authors also state that 3D morphometric methods are minimally affected by inter-observer errors and optical distortions; I would say that this is not necessarily the case, particularly as many 3D methods of statistically analysing shape still require user-input for landmark digitisation etc.

The authors provide very highly detailed step-by-step instructions for how to carry out RTI, including time estimations for processing and storage considerations. I find these details are seldom mentioned so explicitly, but are extremely for useful for early career readers when planning funding bids etc. I note that the post-processing is done in Adobe Photoshop. I wonder if the authors could provide some examples of free/more accessible software that the reader could use as an alternative?

The figures are generally very good and informative. I would suggest that the caption of Figure 6 needs more details to help the reader interpret the figure. What are the blue squares and black lines? How does what is shown relate to the final 3D model created? Currently, the caption is not sufficient to understand the process being detailed. The authors also provide the data used for the production of the RTI models, in case readers want to try out the methodology for themselves.